Short-time expansion of Heisenberg operators in open collective quantum spin systems
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We present a new method to compute short-time expectation values in large collective spin systems with generic Markovian decoherence. Our method is based on a Taylor expansion of a formal solution to the equations of motion for Heisenberg operators. This expansion can be truncated at finite order to obtain virtually exact results at short times that are relevant for metrological applications such as spin squeezing. In order to evaluate the expansion for Heisenberg operators, we compute the relevant structure constants of a collective spin operator algebra. We demonstrate the utility of our method by computing spin squeezing, two-time correlation functions, and out-of-time-ordered correlators for $10^8$ spins in strong-decoherence regimes that are otherwise inaccessible via existing numerical methods. Our method can be straightforwardly generalized to the case of a collective spin coupled to bosonic modes, relevant for trapped ion and cavity QED experiments, and may be used to investigate short-time signatures of quantum chaos and information scrambling.

I. INTRODUCTION

Collective spin systems are a versatile resource in quantum science for a range of applications including quantum-enhanced metrology and quantum simulation. Theoretical interest in such systems dates back to the mid-twentieth century with the introduction of the Dicke model[1] that describes atoms cooperatively interacting with a single mode of a radiation field, and the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model, a toy model for testing many-body approximation methods in contemporary nuclear physics[2–4]. On the experimental side, the development of advanced trapping, cooling, and control techniques in atomic, molecular, and optical (AMO) systems have enabled the realization of collective spin models in a broad range of platforms, including atomic ensembles[5–9], Bose-Einstein condensates[10–12], ultracold Fermi gases[13, 14], trapped ions[15], optical cavities[16–23], and molecular sensors[24]. These implementations have triggered studies of a variety of rich subjects, including quantum criticality[25–32], non-equilibrium phenomena[12, 14, 21, 33–37], and precision metrology[5–11, 16–20, 22–24, 38–47].

One of the primary motivations for studying collective spin systems is their application to quantum-enhanced metrology. Quantum projection noise limits the error $\Delta \phi$ in the measurement of a phase angle $\phi$ with $N$ independent spins to $\Delta \phi \sim 1/\sqrt{N}[38, 39, 41]$. Collective spin systems enable a means to break through this limit via the preparation of many-body entangled states such as NOON[7, 24, 42], spin-cat[43–45], and spin-squeezed states[5, 6, 8–11, 16–20, 22, 23, 38, 40, 41, 46, 47] that allow for measurement errors $\Delta \phi \sim 1/N^\varepsilon$ with $1/2 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, where $\varepsilon = 1$ satirates the Heisenberg limit[48]. Generating such states typically requires nonlinear dynamics that are realized using collisional, photon-mediated, or phonon-mediated interactions. Although a truly collective spin model requires uniform, all-to-all interactions, as long as measurements do not distinguish between constituent particles, even non-uniform systems may be effectively described by a uniform model with renormalized parameters[49].

In the absence of decoherence, permutation symmetry and total spin conservation divide the total Hilbert space of a collective spin system into superselection sectors that grow only linearly with system size $N$, thereby admitting efficient classical simulation of its dynamics. Decoherence generally violates total spin conservation and requires the use of density operators, increasing the dimension of accessible state space to $\sim N^3[50, 51]$. In this case, exact simulations can be carried out for $N \lesssim 100$ particles. If decoherence is sufficiently weak, dynamics can be numerically solvable for $N \lesssim 10^5$ particles via “quantum trajectory” Monte Carlo methods[52, 53] (also known as “quantum jump” or “Monte Carlo wavefunction” methods) that can reproduce all expectation values of interest. When decoherence is strong, however, or when the number of jump operators grows extensively with system size (e.g. for single-spin decay), these Monte Carlo methods can take a prohibitively long time to converge, as simulations become dominated by incoherent jumps that generate large numbers of distinct quantum trajectories that need to be averaged in order to compute expectation values.

In this work, we present a new method to compute short-time dynamics of collective spin systems with generic Markovian decoherence. The only restriction on decoherence is that, like the coherent collective dynamics, it must act identically on all constituent particles. This method is based on a short-time expansion of exact solutions to the equations of motion for Heisenberg operators. Evaluating this expansion requires knowing the structure constants of a collective spin operator algebra; the calculation of these structure constants (in Appendices B–D) is one of the main technical results of this work, which we hope will empower both analyt-
ical and numerical studies of collective spin systems in the future. We benchmark our method against both exact and quantum trajectory Monte Carlo computations of spin squeezing in accessible parameter regimes, highlighting both advantages and limitations of our short-time expansion. Finally, we showcase applications of our method with computations that are inaccessible to other numerical methods.

II. THEORY

In this section we provide the basic theory for our method to compute expectation values of collective spin operators, deriving lengthy derivations to the appendices. We consider systems composed of $N$ distinct spin-1/2 particles. Defining individual spin-1/2 operators $\hat{s}_a \equiv \hat{s}_\alpha / 2$ and $\hat{s}_\alpha \equiv i \hat{s}_y = \hat{s}_\pm$ with Pauli operators $\hat{\sigma}_\alpha$, we denote an operator that acts with $\hat{s}_\alpha$ on the spin indexed by $j$ and trivially (i.e. with the identity $\mathbf{1}$) on all other spins by $\hat{s}_j^{(\alpha)}$. We then define the collective spin operators $\hat{S}_\alpha \equiv \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{s}_j^{(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \in \{x,y,z,+,-\}$.

Identifying the set $\{ \hat{S}_m \}$ as a basis for all collective spin operators, with $m \equiv (m_+,m_z,m_-) \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ and $\hat{S}_m \equiv \hat{S}_+ \hat{S}_z \hat{S}_-^\dagger$, we can expand any collective spin operator $\hat{O}$ in the form

$$\hat{O} = \sum_m \mathcal{O}_m \hat{S}_m$$

with scalar coefficients $\mathcal{O}_m \in \mathbb{C}$. If $\hat{O}$ is self-adjoint, for example, then $\mathcal{O}_m = \mathcal{O}_m^\dagger$, with $m^* \equiv (m_-,m_z,m_+)$. The corresponding Heisenberg operator is then $\hat{O}(t) = \sum_m \mathcal{O}_m(t) \hat{S}_m$, with time-dependent coefficients $\mathcal{O}_m(t)$ for time-independent (Schrödinger) operators $\hat{S}_m$. The time evolution of Heisenberg operators is determined by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{O}(t) = \hat{T} \hat{O}(t) = \sum_{m,n} \hat{S}_m T_{mn} \mathcal{O}_n(t)$$

for a time derivative (super-)operator $\hat{T}$ with matrix elements $T_{mn} \in \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\hat{T} \hat{S}_n \equiv i \left[ \hat{H}, \hat{S}_n \right] + \sum_{\alpha} \gamma_\alpha \hat{D}(\hat{A}) \hat{S}_n = \sum_m \hat{S}_m T_{mn}.$$  

(3)

where $[X,Y]_\pm \equiv XY \pm YX$; $\hat{H}$ is the collective spin Hamiltonian; $\hat{A}$ is a set of jump operators with a corresponding decoherence rate $\gamma_\alpha$; and $\hat{D}$ is a Heisenberg-picture dissipator, or Lindblad superoperator, defined by

$$\hat{D}(\hat{A}) \hat{O} \equiv \sum_{\alpha \in \hat{A}} \left( \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{D} \hat{A} + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{A}, \hat{O} \right]_+ \right).$$

(4)

Decoherence via uncorrelated decay of individual spins, for example, would be described by the set of jump operators $\hat{A}_- \equiv \{ \hat{s}_j^{(\pm)} : j = 1,2,\ldots,N \}$. The commutator in Eq. (3) can be computed by expanding the product $\hat{S}_m \hat{S}_n = \sum_k \ell_{mn} \hat{S}_n$ with structure constants $\ell_{mn} \in \mathbb{R}$ that we work out in Appendices B–D, and the effects of decoherence from jump operators (i.e. elements of $\hat{A}$) of the form $\hat{g}^{(j)} = \sum_\alpha g_\alpha \hat{s}_j^{(\alpha)}$ and $\hat{G} = \sum_\alpha G_\alpha \hat{S}_\alpha$ are worked out in Appendices E–H. We consider these calculations to be some of the main technical contributions of this work, with potential applications beyond the short-time simulation method presented here. These ingredients are sufficient to compute matrix elements $T_{mn}$ of the time derivative operator $\hat{T}$ in Eq. (3) in most cases of practical interest.

The time derivative operator $\hat{T}$ will generally couple spin operators $\hat{S}_n$ to spin operators $\hat{S}_m$ with higher "weight", i.e. with $|m| > |n|$, where $|\ell| \equiv \sum_\alpha \ell_\alpha$. The growth of operator weight signifies the growth of many-body correlations. In practice, keeping track of this growth will eventually require more computational resources than are available, meaning we must somehow truncate our equations of motion. The simplest truncation strategy would be to take

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{O}(t) \rightarrow \sum_{w(m)<W} \hat{S}_m \sum_n T_{mn} \mathcal{O}_n(t)$$

(5)

for some weight measure $w$, e.g. $w(m) = |m|$, and a high-weight cutoff $W$. The truncation in Eq. (5) closes the system of differential equations defined by Eq. (2), and allows us to solve it using standard numerical methods. Some initial conditions for this system of differential equations, namely expectation values of collective spin operators with respect to spin-polarized (Gaussian) states that are generally simple to prepare experimentally, are provided in Appendix I.

The truncation strategy in Eq. (5) has a few limitations: (i) simulating a system of differential equations for a large number of operators can be time-consuming, (ii) the weight measure $w$ may need to be chosen carefully, as the optimal measure is generally system-dependent, and (iii) simulation results can only be trusted up to the time at which the initial value of operators $\hat{S}_m$ with weight $w(m) \geq W$ have a non-negligible contribution to expectation values of interest. The last limitation in particular unavoidably applies in some form to any method tracking only a subset of all relevant operators. We therefore devise an alternate truncation strategy built around limitation (iii).

We can formally expand Heisenberg operators $\hat{O}(t)$ in a Taylor series about the time $t = 0$ to write

$$\hat{O}(t) = e^{i \hat{T}} \hat{O}(0) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{t^k}{k!} \sum_m T_m t_{mn} \mathcal{O}_n(0),$$

(6)

where the matrix elements $T_m t_{mn}$ of the $k$-th time deriva-
tive operator \( T^k \) are

\[
T_{mn}^0 \equiv \delta_{mn}, \\
T_{mn}^1 \equiv T_{mn}, \\
T_{mn}^{k>1} \equiv \sum_{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{k-1}} T_{mp_{k-1}} T_{p_1 p_2} \ldots T_{p_{k-1} p_{k-1}} T_{p_{k-1} n},
\]

with \( \delta_{mn} = 1 \) if \( m = n \) and 0 otherwise. For sufficiently short times, we can truncate the series in Eq. (6) by taking

\[
\hat{O}(t) \rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{M} \frac{t^k}{k!} \sum_{m,n} \hat{S}_m T_{mn}^k \mathcal{O}_n(0).
\]  

We refer Eq. (10) as the truncated short-time (TST) expansion of Heisenberg operators. Unlike the truncation in Eq. (5), the nonzero matrix elements \( T_{mn}^k \) for \( k = 0,1,\ldots, M \) in Eq. (10) tell us which operators are relevant for computing the expectation value \( \langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle \) to a fixed order \( M \). Note that using the relation \( \hat{S}_m^0 = \hat{S}_m \), which by Hermitian conjugation of Eq. (2) also implies that \( T_{mn}^{m\ast n} = T_{mn}^m \), can cut both the number of initial-time expectation values \( \langle \hat{S}_m \rangle_{t=0} \) and the number of matrix elements \( T_{mn} \) that we may need to explicitly compute roughly in half.

In principle, the factorial suppression of terms at higher orders of the expansion in Eq. (6) implies for any given time \( t \), there exists a truncation order \( M_t \) for which the truncation error in Eq. (10) is negligibly small. In practice, only a maximal truncation order \( M_{\text{max}} \) is accessible with limited computational resources, such that the TST expansion in Eq. (10) only allows for computation of the expectation value \( \langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle \) to a maximal time \( t_{M_{\text{max}}} \). As we will see in the following section, \( M_{\text{max}} = 35 \) will suffice for the computation of collective spin correlators up to times that are relevant e.g. for spin squeezing protocols. Appendix J provides a pedagogical tutorial for computing correlators using the TST expansion.

### III. SPIN SQUEEZING, BENCHMARKING, AND BREAKDOWN

To benchmark our method for computing collective spin correlators, we consider three collective spin models known to generate spin-squeezed states: the one-axis twisting (OAT), two-axis twisting (TAT), and twist-and-turn (TNT) models described by the collective spin Hamiltonians\[40, 54\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H_{\text{OAT}} &= \chi \hat{S}_z^2, \\
H_{\text{TAT}} &= \frac{\chi}{3} \left( \hat{S}_z^2 - \hat{S}_y^2 \right), \\
H_{\text{TNT}} &= \chi \hat{S}_z^2 + \Omega \hat{S}_x,
\end{align*}
\]

where we include a factor of \( 1/3 \) in the TAT Hamiltonian because it naturally appears in realistic proposals to experimentally implement TAT\[55, 56\]. For simplicity, we further fix \( \Omega = \chi S \) (with \( S \equiv N/2 \) throughout this work) to the critical value known to maximize the entanglement generation rate of TNT in the large-\( N \) limit\[54, 57\].

Note that the OAT model is a special case of the zero-field Ising model, whose quantum dynamics admits an exact analytic solution even in the presence of decoherence\[58\]. We will benchmark our calculations using these analytical OAT results wherever applicable (see Appendix A, as well as the Supplementary Material of Ref. [15]).

The Hamiltonians in Eqs. (11)–(13) squeeze the initial product state \( |X⟩ \propto (|↑⟩ + |↓⟩) \otimes^N \) with \( \hat{S}_x |X⟩ = S |X⟩ \). Our measure of spin squeezing is the directionally-unbiased Ramsey squeezing parameter determined by the maximal gain in resolution \( \Delta \phi \) of a phase \( \phi \) over that achieved by any spin-polarized product state (e.g. \( |X⟩ \))[38, 41],

\[
\xi^2 = \frac{(\Delta \phi_{\text{min}})^2}{(\Delta \phi_{\text{polarized}})^2} = \frac{N}{|\langle \hat{S} \rangle|^2} \min_{v \perp \langle \hat{S} \rangle} \left\langle \left( \langle \hat{S} \cdot v \rangle \right)^2 \right\rangle,
\]

where \( \hat{S} = (\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z) \) is a collective spin operator-valued vector, and the minimization is performed over all unit vectors \( v \) orthogonal to the mean spin vector \( \langle \hat{S} \rangle \). This squeezing parameter is entirely determined by one- and two-spin correlators of the form \( \langle \hat{S}_a \rangle \) and \( \langle \hat{S}_a \hat{S}_b \rangle \). For the unitary dynamics discussed in this work, these correlators are obtainable via exact simulations of quantum dynamics in the \((N+1)\)-dimensional Dicke manifold of states \{ \( |S,m⟩ \) \} with net spin \( S \) and spin projection \( m \) onto the z axis, i.e. with \( \langle S,m | \hat{S}^2 | S,m \rangle = S(S+1) \) and \( \langle S,m | \hat{S}_z | S,m \rangle = m \) for \( m \in \{ -S,-S+1,\ldots,S \} \). In the presence of single-spin or collective decoherence, meanwhile, these correlators are obtainable with the collective-spin quantum trajectory Monte Carlo method developed in ref. [33]. In this work, these exact and quantum trajectory simulations will be used to benchmark the TST expansion in Eq. (10).

Figure 1 compares the squeezing parameter \( \xi^2 \) for \( N = 10^4 \) spins initially in the state \( |X⟩ \) evolved under the Hamiltonians in Eqs. (11)–(13), as computed via both benchmarking simulations and the TST expansion in Eq. (10) with \( M = 35 \). Squeezing is shown for both unitary dynamics (Figure 1a), as well as non-unitary dynamics in the presence of spontaneous decay, excitation, and dephasing of individual spins at rates \( \chi \) (Figure 1b), respectively described by the sets of jump operators \( A_\alpha \equiv \{ \hat{s}_\alpha^{(+)} \} \) with corresponding decoherence rates \( \gamma_\alpha = \chi \) for \( \alpha \in \{ -, +, z \} \). The results shown in Figure 1 were computed in a rotated basis with \( (\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_z) \rightarrow (\hat{s}_x, -\hat{s}_z) \) and \( |X⟩ \rightarrow |Z⟩ \equiv |↓⟩ \otimes^N \) (together with appropriate transformations of the Hamiltonian and jump operators): the only effect of this rotation on the results presented in Figure 1 is to prolong the time for which the TST expansion agrees with the benchmarking simulations. The reason for different results in rotated
basis has to do with the breakdown of the TST expansion, which we discuss further below.

The main lesson from Figure 1 is that the TST expansion gives essentially exact results right up until a sudden and drastic departure that can be diagnosed by inspection. The breakdown of the TST expansion in Figure 1 is marked by an unphysical squeezing parameter $\xi^2 < 0$, which occurs due to individual correlators taking unphysical values $|\langle \hat{S}_m \rangle| \gg \hat{S}_m$. The sudden and drastic departure from virtually exact results occurs because the TST expansion neglects high-weight (i.e. large-$|m|$) operators $\hat{S}_m$ whose contributions to a Heisenberg operator $\hat{O}(t)$ of interest eventually become non-negligible. For sufficiently large times $t$, these individual contributions may generally be large compared to the value of $\langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle$, in which case their truncation will neglect terms that are large compared to the actual value of $\langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle$. This breakdown mechanism is also the reason for prolonged agreement between the TST expansion and benchmarking methods when squeezing the initial state $|\rangle \langle -Z \rangle$ rather than $|X \rangle$: for initial states $|\rangle \langle -Z \rangle$, all initial-time correlators $\langle \hat{S}_m \rangle_{t=0}$ vanish unless $m_+ = m_- = 0$ (see Appendix I), so there is a substantially smaller number of neglected terms with non-zero contribution to the correlator $\langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle$.

Although the TST expansion breaks down at short times, it has two key advantages over other methods to compute collective spin correlators. First, computing spin correlators with the TST expansion is generally much faster and requires much fewer computing resources than the alternatives. The quantum trajectory Monte Carlo simulations performed for Figure 1b, for example, take $\sim 10^4$ CPU hours to compute on standard modern computing hardware; the bulk of this time is spent performing sparse matrix-vector multiplication, leaving little room to further optimize run time. Parallelization can reduce the actual run time of these quantum trajectory simulations to $\sim 10$ hours, but at the cost of greatly increasing computing resource requirements. The TST expansion results in Figure 1b, meanwhile, take $\sim 10$ seconds to compute with a single CPU on similar hardware.

Second, the TST expansion enables computing spin correlators in strong-decoherence regimes entirely inaccessible to other methods. As an example, Figure 2 shows squeezing of $N = 10^4$ spins initially in $|X \rangle$, undergoing spontaneous decay, excitation, and dephasing of individual spins at rates $\gamma_- = \gamma_+ = \gamma_0 = 100\chi$. Computed using the TST expansion in Eq. (10) with $M = 35$. Solid circles mark the times at which the TST expansion gives an unphysical result with $\xi^2 < 0$.

FIG. 1. Spin squeezing of $N = 10^4$ spins initially in $|X \rangle$ under (a) unitary and (b) non-unitary dynamics, computed using exact methods (solid lines), quantum trajectory simulations (dots), and the TST expansion in Eq. (10) with $M = 35$ (dashed lines). Solid circles mark the times at which the TST expansion gives an unphysical result with $\xi^2 < 0$.
tion of the TST expansion and the collective-spin structure constants calculated in this work.

IV. TWO-TIME CORRELATION FUNCTIONS AND OUT-OF-TIME-ORDERED CORRELATORS

As a final example of collective-spin physics that is numerically accessible via the TST expansion of Heisenberg operators, we consider the calculation of two-time correlation functions and out-of-time-ordered correlators (OTOCs). In particular, we consider the effect of decoherence on short-time behavior of the two-time connected correlator

\[ C(t) \equiv \frac{1}{S} \left( \langle \hat{S}_+ (t) \hat{S}_- (0) \rangle - \langle \hat{S}_+ (t) \rangle \langle \hat{S}_- (0) \rangle \right), \tag{15} \]

and the expectation value of a squared commutator,

\[ D(t) \equiv \frac{1}{S^2} \left( [\hat{S}_+ (t), \hat{S}_- (0)]^\dagger \left[ \hat{S}_+ (t), \hat{S}_- (0) \right] \right), \tag{16} \]

in the context of the squeezing models in Section III. In an equilibrium setting, correlation functions similar to that in Eq. (15) contain information about the linear response of Heisenberg operators to perturbations of a system; in a non-equilibrium setting, they contribute to short-time linear response (see Appendix K). Similar correlators have made appearances as order parameters for diagnosing time-crystalline phases of matter\cite{60–62}. Squared commutators such as that in Eq. (16), meanwhile, are commonly examined for signatures of quantum chaos and information scrambling\cite{60–62}. In typical scenarios, such squared commutators initially vanish by construction due to a choice of operators with spatially separated non-trivial support. Collective spin systems, however, have no intrinsic notion of locality or spatial separation. In our case, therefore, with the choice of initial state \(|X\rangle \propto (|↑\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)^{\otimes N}\), we merely have \(D(0) \sim 1/N\).

Figure 3 shows the behavior of \(C(t)\) and \(D(t)\) for \(N = 10^4\) spins, initially in the state \(|X\rangle\), evolving under the squeezing Hamiltonians in Eqs. (11)–(13) both with and without spontaneous decay, excitation, and dephasing of individual spins at rates \(\gamma_- = \gamma_+ = \gamma_x = 100\chi\). In the case of unitary evolution under OAT, we find that to an excellent approximation \(|C(t)\rangle \) takes the functional form \(f(t) = f(0) + aN\chi t + (bN\chi)^2 t^2\) with \(a \sim b \sim 1\), and with a virtually perfect fit \(D(t) = D(0) + (N + 1)\chi^2 t^2\). For unitary evolution under TAT and TNT, we find that to an excellent approximation both \(|C(t)\rangle \) and \(D(t)\) take the functional form \(f(t) = f(0) + a [\exp(bN\chi t) - 1]\) with \(a \sim b \sim 1\). As may be expected, the growth of \(C(t)\) and \(D(t)\) is generally suppressed by decoherence. Figure 3 serves as an example for the type of behavior that is accessible at short times with the TST expansion. These examples are straightforward extend to equilibrium settings and spin-boson systems.

FIG. 3. The two-time connected correlator \(C(t)\) and squared commutator \(D(t)\), respectively defined in Eqs. (15) and (16), for \(N = 10^4\) spins initially in the polarized state \(|X\rangle\) evolving under the squeezing Hamiltonians in Eqs. (11)–(13). Results are shown for both unitary dynamics (solid lines) and non-unitary dynamics with \(\gamma_- = \gamma_+ = \gamma_x = 100\chi\) (dashed lines), computed using the TST expansion in Eq. (10) with \(M = 20\).

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a new method for computing correlators at short times in collective spin systems. This method is based on truncating a short-time expansion of Heisenberg operators, and can access correlators on time scales that are relevant to metrological applications such as spin squeezing. In order to evaluate the truncated short-time (TST) expansion of Heisenberg operators, we have computed the structure constants of a collective spin operator algebra, which we hope will empower future analytical and numerical studies of collective spin systems. Even though we considered only non-equilibrium spin-squeezing processes in this work, our method can be ap-
plied directly in an equilibrium setting, and is straightforward to generalize to systems such as trapped ions and optical cavities with collective spin-boson interactions. In such contexts, our method may be used to benchmark the short-time effects of decoherence, or study the onset of quantum chaos and information scrambling.
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Appendix A: Analytical results for the one-axis twisting model

The one-axis twisting (OAT) Hamiltonian for \( N \) spin-1/2 particles takes the form

\[
H_{\text{OAT}} = \chi S_z^2 = \frac{1}{2} \chi \sum_{j<k} \sigma_z^{(j)} \sigma_z^{(k)} + \frac{1}{4} N \chi, \tag{A1}
\]

where \( \sigma_z^{(j)} \) represents a Pauli-\( z \) operator acting on spin \( j \). This model is a special case of the zero-field Ising Hamiltonian previously solved in Ref. [58] via exact, analytical treatment of the quantum trajectory Monte Carlo method for computing expectation values. The solution therein accounts for coherent evolution in addition to decoherence via uncorrelated single-spin decay, excitation, and dephasing respectively at rates \( \gamma_-, \gamma_+, \) and \( \gamma_z \) (denoted by \( \Gamma_{ud}, \Gamma_{du}, \) and \( \Gamma_{el} \) in Ref. [58]). Letting \( S \equiv N/2 \) and \( \mu, \nu \in \{+1, -1\} \), we adapt expectation values computed in Ref. [58] for the initial state \( |X\rangle \propto (|↑⟩ + |↓⟩)^{\otimes N} \) with \( S_z |X\rangle = S |X\rangle \) evolving under \( H_{\text{OAT}} \), finding

\[
\langle S_+ \rangle = Se^{-\Gamma t} \Phi(\chi, t)^{N-1}, \tag{A2}
\]
\[
\langle S_\mu S_\nu \rangle = -\frac{\mu}{2} \langle S_\mu \rangle + S \left( S - \frac{1}{2} \right) e^{-\Gamma t} \Psi(\mu \chi, t) \Phi(\chi, t)^{N-2}, \tag{A3}
\]
\[
\langle S_\mu S_\nu \rangle = \delta_{\mu, -\nu} \left( S + \mu \langle S_z \rangle \right) + S \left( S - \frac{1}{2} \right) e^{-2\Gamma t} \Phi(\mu + \nu \chi, t)^{N-2}, \tag{A4}
\]

where

\[
\Phi(X, t) \equiv e^{-\lambda t} \left[ \cos \left( t \sqrt{q_X^2 - r} \right) + \lambda t \text{sinc} \left( t \sqrt{q_X^2 - r} \right) \right], \tag{A5}
\]
\[
\Psi(X, t) \equiv e^{-\lambda t} (iq_X - \gamma) t \text{sinc} \left( t \sqrt{q_X^2 - r} \right), \tag{A6}
\]

for

\[
\gamma \equiv -\frac{1}{2} (\gamma_+ - \gamma_-), \quad \lambda \equiv \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-), \quad \Gamma \equiv \lambda + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_z, \quad r \equiv \gamma_+ \gamma_- - N, \quad q_X \equiv X + i\gamma. \tag{A7}
\]

In order to compute spin squeezing as measured by the Ramsey squeezing parameter \( \xi^2 \) defined in (14), we additionally need analytical expressions for \( \langle S_z \rangle \) and \( \langle S_z^2 \rangle \). As these operators commute with both the OAT Hamiltonian and the single-spin operators \( \sigma_z^{(j)} \), their evolution is governed entirely by decay-type decoherence (see Appendix F 1), which means

\[
\frac{d}{dt} S_z = S (\gamma_+ - \gamma_-) - (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-) S_z, \tag{A8}
\]
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \langle S_z^2 \rangle = S (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-) + 2 \left( S - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\gamma_+ - \gamma_-) S_z - 2 (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-) \langle S_z^2 \rangle. \tag{A9}
\]
The initial conditions \( \langle S_z \rangle_{t=0} = 0 \) and \( \langle S_z^2 \rangle_{t=0} = S/2 \) then imply
\[
\langle S_z \rangle = S \left( \frac{\gamma_+ - \gamma_-}{\gamma_+ + \gamma_-} \right) \left( 1 - e^{-\left(\gamma_+ + \gamma_-\right)t} \right), \quad \langle S_z^2 \rangle = S \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \left( S - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\langle S_z \rangle^2}{S^2} \right]. \tag{A10}
\]

With appropriate assumptions about the relevant sources of decoherence, the expectation values in (A2)–(A4) and (A10) are sufficient to compute the spin squeezing parameter \( \xi^2 \) in (14) at any time throughout evolution of the initial state \( |X\rangle \) under \( H_{OAT} \).

### Appendix B: Basic spin operator identities

The appendices in this work make ubiquitous use of various spin operator identities; we collect and derive some basic identities here for reference. Note that despite the working definition of collective spin operators from \( S_a = \sum_j s^{(j)}_a \), the identities we will derive involving only collective spin operators apply just as well to large-spin operators that cannot be expressed as the sum of individual spin-1/2 operators. The elementary commutation relations between spin operators are, with \( \mu \equiv -\mu \in \{ +1, -1 \} \) for brevity,
\[
\begin{align*}
[s^{(j)}_\mu, s^{(k)}_{\mu'}]_- &= \delta_{jk} \mu s^{(j)}_{\mu}, \\
[s^{(j)}_{\mu}, s^{(k)}_{\mu}]_- &= \delta_{jk} 2 \mu s^{(j)}_z, \\
[s^{(j)}_\mu, s^{(k)}_{\mu'}]_- &= \delta_{jk} 2 \mu s^{(j)}_z, \\
[s^{(j)}_{\mu}, s^{(k)}_{\mu'}]_- &= \delta_{jk} \mu s^{(j)}_z, \\
[S_z, S_\mu]_- &= \mu S_\mu. \tag{B1}
\end{align*}
\]

These relations can be used to inductively compute identities involving powers of collective spin operators. By pushing through one spin operator at a time, we can find
\[
(\mu S_\mu)^m s^{(j)}_\mu = (\mu S_\mu)^{m-2} s^{(j)}_\mu (1 + \mu S_\mu) = (\mu S_\mu)^{m-2} s^{(j)}_\mu (1 + \mu S_\mu)^2 = \cdots = s^{(j)}_\mu (1 + \mu S_\mu)^m, \tag{B3}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
\mu s^{(j)}_z S_\mu &= s^{(j)}_{\mu} \mu s^{(j)}_z S_\mu, \\
S_\mu s^{(j)}_z S_\mu &= s^{(j)}_{\mu} S_\mu s^{(j)}_z S_\mu, \\
S_\mu &= \mu S_\mu, \tag{B6}
\end{align*}
\]

where we will generally find it nicer to express results in terms of \( \mu s^{(j)}_z \) and \( S_\mu \) rather than \( s^{(j)}_{\mu} \) and \( S_\mu \). Summing over the single-spin index \( j \) in both of the cases above gives us the purely collective-spin versions of these identities:
\[
(\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu = (\mu S_\mu)^{m-1} s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu) = (\mu S_\mu)^{m-2} s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^2 = \cdots = s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^m, \tag{B5}
\]

where we can repeat the process of pushing through individual \( S_\mu \) operators \( \ell \) times to get
\[
(\mu S_\mu)^\ell S_\mu = (\mu S_\mu)^{\ell-1} s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu) = (\mu S_\mu)^{\ell-2} s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^2 = \cdots = s^{(j)}_{\mu} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^\ell. \tag{B6}
\]

Multiplying (B6) through by \( (\mu S_\mu)^\ell \) (for \( \nu \in \{ +1, -1 \} \)) and taking its Hermitian conjugate, we can say that more generally
\[
(\nu S_\mu)^\ell S_\mu = S_\mu (\nu S_\mu)^{\ell-1} \mu s^{(j)}_{\mu} \tag{B7}
\]

Finding commutation relations between powers of transverse spin operators, i.e. \( S_\mu \) and \( S_{\mu'} \), turns out to be considerably more difficult than the cases we have worked out thus far. We therefore save this work for Appendix C.

### Appendix C: Commutation relations between powers of transverse spin operators

To find commutation relations between powers of transverse collective spin operators, we first compute
\[
\begin{align*}
S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} S_{\mu} &= S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} + S^{m-1}_{\mu} 2 s^{(j)}_{\mu} \\
S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} S_{\mu} &= S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} S_{\mu} + S^{m-1}_{\mu} 2 s^{(j)}_{\mu} \\
S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} S_{\mu} &= S^{m-2}_{\mu} s^{(j)}_{\mu} + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} 2 s^{k}_{\mu} S^{m-k-1}_{\mu}. \tag{C3}
\end{align*}
\]
While (C3) gives us the commutator $[S_{\mu}^m, s_{(j)}^{(j)}]$, we would like to enforce an ordering on products of spin operators, which will ensure that we only keep track of operators that are linearly independent. We choose (for now) to impose an ordering with all $s_{(j)}^{(j)}$ operators on the left, and all $s_{(j)}^{(j)}$ operators on the right. Such an ordering will prove convenient for the calculations in this section\textsuperscript{[63]}. This choice of ordering compels us to expand

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} S_{\mu}^k 2 \mu_{s_{(j)}^{(j)}} S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} S_{\mu}^k \left[ 2 (m - k - 1) s_{(j)}^{(j)} S_{\mu}^{m-k-2} + S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} 2 \mu_{s_{(j)}^{(j)}} \right] 
$$

$$
= m (m - 1) s_{(j)}^{(j)} S_{\mu}^{m-2} + m S_{\mu}^{m-1} 2 \mu_{s_{(j)}^{(j)}},
$$

which implies

$$
S_{(j)}^{m} s_{(j)}^{(j)} = s_{(j)}^{(j)} S_{(j)}^{m} + m (m - 1) s_{(j)}^{(j)} S_{(j)}^{m-2} + m S_{(j)}^{m-1} 2 \mu_{s_{(j)}^{(j)}},
$$

and in turn

$$
S_{\mu}^{m} S_{\mu} = S_{\mu} S_{\mu}^{m} + m S_{\mu}^{m-1} (m - 1 + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}).
$$

As the next logical step, we take on the task of computing

$$
S_{\mu}^{m} S_{\mu}^{n} = S_{\mu}^{m-1} S_{\mu}^{n} S_{\mu} + n \left[ S_{\mu}^{n-1} S_{\mu}^{m-1} (1 - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}) \right] = S_{\mu}^{m} S_{\mu}^{n} + n \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} S_{\mu}^{n-1} (1 - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}) S_{\mu}^{k},
$$

which implies

$$
\left[ S_{\mu}^{m}, S_{\mu}^{n} \right] = C_{mn;\mu} = n \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} S_{\mu}^{n-1} (1 - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}) S_{\mu}^{k}.
$$

We now need rearrange the operators in $C_{mn;\mu}$ into a standard order, which means pushing all $S_{\mu}$ operators to the right and, for the purposes of this calculation, all $S_{\mu}^{n-1}$ operators to the left. We begin by pushing $S_{\mu}^{k}$ to the left of $S_{\mu}$, which takes $2 \mu_{S_{\mu}} \to 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}} + 2k$, and then push $S_{\mu}^{m-k-1}$ to the right of $S_{\mu}^{n-1}$, giving us

$$
C_{mn;\mu} = n \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left( S_{\mu}^{n-1} S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} + C_{m-k-1,n-1,\mu} \right) S_{\mu}^{k} (2k + 1 - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}})
$$

$$
= C_{mn;\mu} + m \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} C_{m-k-1,n-1,\mu} S_{\mu}^{k} (2k + 1 - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}),
$$

where we have dropped the last ($k = m - 1$) term in the remaining sum because $C_{m-k-1,n-1,\mu} = 0$ if $k = m - 1$, and

$$
D_{mn;\mu} \equiv mn S_{\mu}^{n-1} S_{\mu}^{m-1} (m - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}).
$$

To our despair, we have arrived in (C11) at a recursive formula for $C_{mn;\mu}$. Furthermore, we have not even managed to order all spin operators, as $C_{m-k-1,n-1,\mu}$ contains $S_{\mu}$ operators that are to the left of $S_{\mu}^{k}$. To sort all spin operators once and for all, we define

$$
C_{mn;\mu}^{(k)} \equiv C_{m-k,n,\mu} S_{\mu}^{k},
$$

$$
D_{mn;\mu}^{(k)} \equiv D_{m-k,n,\mu} S_{\mu}^{k},
$$

which we can expand as

$$
D_{mn;\mu}^{(k)} = (m - k) n S_{\mu}^{n-1} S_{\mu}^{m-k-1} (m - k - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}) S_{\mu}^{k}
$$

$$
= (m - k) n S_{\mu}^{n-1} S_{\mu}^{m-1} (k + m - n + 2 \mu_{S_{\mu}}),
$$
We now further define

\[ C^{(k)}_{mn;\mu} = D_{m-k,n;\mu} S^k + n \sum_{j=0}^{m-k-2} C_{m-k-j-1,n-1;\mu} S^j \left( 2j + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right) S^k \]  

(C16)

\[ = D^{(k)}_{mn;\mu} + n \sum_{j=0}^{m-k-2} C_{m-k-j-1,n-1;\mu} S^{j+k} \left( 2j + 2k + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right) \]  

(C17)

\[ = D^{(k)}_{mn;\mu} + n \sum_{j=0}^{m-k-2} C^{(k+j)}_{m-1,n-1;\mu} \left( 2 \left[ j + k \right] + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right) \]  

(C18)

\[ = D^{(k)}_{mn;\mu} + n \sum_{j=k}^{m-2} C^{(j)}_{m-1,n-1;\mu} \left( 2j + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right). \]  

(C19)

While the resulting expression in (C19) strongly resembles that in (C11), there is one crucial difference: all spin operators in (C19) have been sorted into a standard order. We can now repeatedly substitute \( C^{(k)}_{mn;\mu} \) into itself, each time decreasing \( m \) and \( n \) by 1, until one of \( m \) or \( n \) reaches zero. Such repeated substitution yields the expansion

\[ C_{mn;\mu} = C^{(0)}_{mn;\mu} = D_{mn;\mu} + \sum_{p=1}^{\min\{m,n\}-1} E^{(p)}_{mn;\mu}, \]  

(C20)

where the first two terms in the sum over \( p \) are

\[ E^{(1)}_{mn;\mu} = n \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} D^{(k)}_{m-1,n-1;\mu} \left( 2k + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right), \]  

(C21)

\[ E^{(2)}_{mn;\mu} = n \sum_{k=1}^{m-2} (n-1) \sum_{k_2=k_1}^{m-3} D^{(k_3)}_{m-2,n-2;\mu} \left( 2k_2 + 2 - n + 2\mu S_z \right) \left( 2k_1 + 1 - n + 2\mu S_z \right), \]  

(C22)

and more generally for \( p > 1, \)

\[ E^{(p)}_{mn;\mu} = \frac{n!}{(n-p)!} \sum_{k_1=0}^{m-2} \sum_{k_2=k_1}^{m-3} \cdots \sum_{k_{p-1}=k_{p-2}}^{m-p-1} D^{(k_p)}_{m-p,n-p;\mu} \prod_{j=1}^{p} \left( 2k_j + j - n + 2\mu S_z \right). \]  

(C23)

In principle, the expressions in (C12), (C15), (C20), and (C23) suffice to evaluate the commutator \( [S^m_\mu, S^n_\mu] = C_{mn;\mu}, \) but this result is – put lightly – quite a mess: the expression for \( E^{(p)}_{mn;\mu} \) in (C23) involves a sum over \( p \) mutually dependent intermediate variables, each term of which additionally contains a product of \( p \) factors. We therefore devote the rest of this section to simplifying our result for the commutator \( [S^m_\mu, S^n_\mu] \).

Observing that in (C23) we always have \( 0 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_p \leq m-p-1, \) we can rearrange the order of the sums and relabel \( k_p \to \ell \) to get

\[ E^{(p)}_{mn;\mu} = \frac{n!}{(n-p)!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-p-1} D^{(\ell)}_{m-p,n-p;\mu} \left( 2\ell + F_{n,p;\mu} \right) \sum_{(k,p-1,\ell)}^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \left( 2k_{p-j} - j + F_{n,p;\mu} \right), \]  

(C24)

where for shorthand we define

\[ F_{n,p;\mu} \equiv p - n + 2\mu S_z, \]

\[ X \equiv \sum_{(k,q,\ell)}^{\ell} \sum_{k_1=0}^{\ell} \sum_{k_2=k_1}^{\ell} \cdots \sum_{k_{q-1}=k_{q-2}}^{\ell} X. \]  

(C25)

We now further define

\[ f_{n,p,q;\mu} \equiv (\ell - k + q) \left( \ell + k - q + F_{n,p;\mu} \right), \]  

(C26)
and evaluate sums successively over \( k_{p-1}, k_{p-2}, \ldots, k_1 \), finding

\[
\sum_{(k_{p-1}, \ell)} p^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} (2k_{p-j} - j + F_{np;\mu}) = \sum_{(k_{p-2}, \ell)} p^{-1} \prod_{j=2}^{p-1} (2k_{p-j} - j + F_{np;\mu}) f_{np;\mu} (k_{p-2}, 1)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \sum_{(k_{p-r}, \ell)} p^{-1} \prod_{j=r}^{p-1} (2k_{p-j} - j + F_{np;\mu}) \prod_{q=1}^{r-1} f_{np;\mu} (k_{p-r}, q)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \prod_{q=1}^{p-1} f_{np;\mu} (0, q)
\]

\[
= \left( \ell + p - 1 \right) \prod_{q=1}^{p-1} (\ell - q + F_{np;\mu}) .
\]

Substitution of this result together with \( D_{m-n-p;\mu}^{(\ell)} \) using (C15) into (C24) then gives us

\[
E_{mn;\mu}^{(p)} = \frac{n!}{(n-p-1)!} \sum_{\mu} n^{-p-1} \sum_{\mu} m^{-p-1} G_{mn;\mu}
\]

with

\[
G_{mn;\mu} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-n-1} \left( \frac{\ell + p - 1}{p} \right) (m - p - \ell) \left( \ell + m - p + F_{np;\mu} \right) (2\ell + F_{np;\mu}) \prod_{q=1}^{p-1} (\ell - q + F_{np;\mu})
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{m}{p+1} \right) \prod_{q=0}^{p} (m - p - q + F_{np;\mu}) .
\]

We can further simplify

\[
\prod_{q=0}^{p} (m - p - q + F_{np;\mu}) = \prod_{q=0}^{p} (m - n - q + 2\mu S_z) = \sum_{q=0}^{p+1} (-1)^{p+1-q} \left( \frac{p+1}{q} \right) (m - n + 2\mu S_z)^q
\]

where \( \left[ \frac{p}{q} \right] \) is an unsigned Stirling number of the first kind, and finally

\[
\sum_{q=0}^{p} (-1)^{p-q} \left[ \frac{p}{q} \right] (m - n + 2\mu S_z)^q = \sum_{q=0}^{p} (-1)^{p-q} \left[ \frac{p}{q} \right] \sum_{\ell=0}^{q} \left( \frac{q}{\ell} \right) (m - n)^{q-\ell} (2\mu S_z)^{\ell}
\]

\[
= \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} 2^{\ell} \sum_{q=\ell}^{p} (-1)^{p-q} \left[ \frac{p}{q} \right] \left( \frac{q}{\ell} \right) (m - n)^{q-\ell} (\mu S_z)^{\ell} .
\]

Putting everything together, we finally have

\[
E_{mn;\mu}^{(p-1)} = pl \left( \frac{m}{p} \right) \left( \frac{n}{p} \right) S_{\mu}^{n-p} S_{\mu}^{m-p} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \epsilon_{mn;\mu}^{p \ell} (\mu S_z)^{\ell}
\]

with

\[
\epsilon_{mn;\mu}^{p \ell} = 2^\ell \sum_{q=\ell}^{p} (-1)^{p-q} \left[ \frac{p}{q} \right] \left( \frac{q}{\ell} \right) (m - n)^{q-\ell} ,
\]

where in this final form \( E_{mn;\mu}^{(0)} = D_{mn;\mu} \), which together with the expansion for \( C_{mn;\mu} \) in (C20) implies that

\[
\left[ S_{\mu}^{m}, S_{\mu}^{n} \right] = \sum_{p=1}^{\min(m,n)} pl \left( \frac{m}{p} \right) \left( \frac{n}{p} \right) S_{\mu}^{n-p} S_{\mu}^{m-p} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \epsilon_{mn;\mu}^{p \ell} (\mu S_z)^{\ell} ,
\]

(39)
and
\[ S^m_{\mu} S^{n}_{\mu} = \sum_{p=0}^{\min\{m,n\}} p! \binom{m}{p} \binom{n}{p} S^{n-p}_{\mu} S^{m-p}_{\mu} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \epsilon^{p}_{mn} (\mu S_{\ell})^{\ell}. \]  
(C40)

If we wish to order products of collective spin operators with \( S_z \) in between \( S_{\mu} \) and \( S_{\mu} \), then
\[ S^m_{\mu} S^{n}_{\mu} = \sum_{p=0}^{\min\{m,n\}} p! \binom{m}{p} \binom{n}{p} S^{n-p}_{\mu} Z^{(p)}_{mn;\mu} S^{m-p}_{\mu}, \]  
(C41)

where
\[ Z^{(p)}_{mn;\mu} \equiv \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \epsilon^{p}_{mn} (-[m-p] + \mu S_z)^{\ell} = \sum_{q=0}^{p} \zeta^{pq}_{mn} (\mu S_z)^{q}, \]  
(C42)

with
\[ \zeta^{pq}_{mn} \equiv \sum_{\ell=q}^{p} \epsilon^{p}_{mn} (\ell) \left(-1\right)^{\ell} (m-p)^{\ell-q} = (-1)^{p} 2^q \sum_{s=q}^{p} \binom{p}{s} \binom{s}{q} (m + n - 2p)^{\ell-q}. \]  
(C43)

Here \([\frac{p}{2}]\) is an unsigned Stirling number of the first kind.

**Appendix D: Product of arbitrary ordered collective spin operators**

The most general product of collective spin operators that we need to compute is
\[ S^{pqr}_{\ell mn;\mu} = S^p_{\mu} (\mu S_z)^q S^r_{\mu} (\mu S_z)^m S^n_{\mu} = \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{r,\ell\}} k! \binom{r}{k} \binom{\ell}{k} S^{p+\ell-k}_{\mu} \tilde{Z}^{(k)}_{qr \ell mn;\mu} S^{r+n-k}_{\mu}, \]  
(D1)

where
\[ \tilde{Z}^{(k)}_{qr \ell mn;\mu} \equiv (\ell - k + \mu S_z)^q Z^{(k)}_{qr \ell mn;\mu} (r - k + \mu S_z)^m \]  
(D2)

\[ = \sum_{a=0}^{k} \epsilon^{ka}_{r \ell} \sum_{b=0}^{q} (\ell - k)^{q-b} \binom{q}{b} \sum_{c=0}^{m} (r - k)^{m-c} \binom{m}{c} (\mu S_z)^{a+b+c}, \]  
(D3)

is defined in terms of \( Z^{(k)}_{r \ell mn;\mu} \) and \( \zeta^{ka}_{r \ell} \) as respectively given in (C42) and (C43). The (anti-)commutator of two ordered products of collective spin operators is then simply
\[ \left[S^p_{\mu} (\mu S_z)^q S^r_{\mu} (\mu S_z)^m S^n_{\mu}\right]_{\pm} = S^{pqr}_{\ell mn;\mu} \pm S^{pqr}_{\ell mn;\mu}. \]  
(D4)

**Appendix E: Sandwich identities for single-spin decoherence calculations**

In this section we derive several identities that will be necessary for computing the effects of single-spin decoherence on ordered products of collective spin operators, i.e. on operators of the form \( S^{\ell}_{\mu} (\mu S_z)^m S^n_{\mu} \). These identities all involve sandwiching a collective spin operator between operators that act on individual spins only, and summing over all individual spin indices. Our general strategy will be to use commutation relations to push single-spin operators together, and then evaluate the sum to arrive at an expression involving only collective spin operators.

We first compute sums of single-spin operators sandwiching \((\mu S_z)^m\), when necessary making use of the identity in
(B3). Up to Hermitian conjugation, the unique cases are, for $S \equiv N/2$ and $\mu, \nu \in \{+1, -1\}$,

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = \sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} s_{\mu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m = \frac{1}{4} \sum_j 1_j (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m = \frac{1}{2} S (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m, \quad (E1)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m \sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} s_{\mu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m = \frac{1}{2} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m \nu S_{\mu j}^z = \frac{1}{2} \nu S_{\mu j}^z (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m, \quad (E2)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\nu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m s_{\nu j}^{(j)} = 0, \quad (E3)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\nu j}^{(j)} (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m s_{\nu j}^{(j)} = (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m (S - \nu S_{\mu j}^z) (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m = (S - \nu S_{\mu j}^z) (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m. \quad (E4)$$

We are now equipped to derive similar identities for more general collective spin operators. Making heavy use of identities (B4) and (C6) to push single-spin operators through transverse collective-spin operators, we again work through all combinations that are unique up to Hermitian conjugation, finding

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{2} (S - \ell - n) S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n + \frac{1}{2} \ell n S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}, \quad (E5)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{2} \mu S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^n - \mu n S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (S - \ell + \frac{1}{2})(n - 1) S_{\mu j}^n + \mu n S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}, \quad (E6)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = -\frac{1}{2} \mu S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^n + \mu n S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}, \quad (E7)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = n S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^n - n (n - 1) S_{\mu j}^n (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}, \quad (E8)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = S_{\mu j}^\ell (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}, \quad (E9)$$

$$\sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n s_{\mu j}^{(j)} = S_{\mu j}^\ell (S - \ell - n - \mu S_{\mu j}) (1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^n + \ell n (2S - \ell - n + 2) S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 1} (1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}$$

$$+ \ell n (\ell - 1) (n - 1) S_{\mu j}^{\ell n - 2} (S + \mu S_{\mu j}) (-1 + \mu S_{\mu j}) S_{\mu j}^{-1}. \quad (E10)$$

Appendix F: Uncorrelated, permutationally-symmetric single-spin decoherence

In this section we work out the effects of permutationally-symmetric decoherence of individual spins on collective spin operators of the form $S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n$. For compactness, we define

$$\mathcal{D} (g) \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{D} \left( \{ g^{(j)} : j = 1, 2, \cdots, N \} \right) \mathcal{O} = \sum_j \left( g^{(j)} \right)^\dagger \mathcal{O} g^{(j)} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ g^{(j)} \right]^\dagger \left[ g^{(j)} \right] \mathcal{O}, \quad (F1)$$

where $g$ is an operator that acts on a single spin, $g^{(j)}$ is an operator that acts with $g$ on spin $j$ and trivially on all other spins, and $N$ is the total number of spins.

1. Decay-type decoherence

The effect of decoherence via uncorrelated decay ($\mu = -1$) or excitation ($\mu = 1$) of individual spins is described by

$$\mathcal{D} (s_{\mu j}) \mathcal{O} = \sum_j \left( s_{\mu j}^{(j)} \mathcal{O} s_{\mu j}^{(j)} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ s_{\mu j}^{(j)} s_{\mu j}^{(j)} \right] \mathcal{O} \right) = \sum_j s_{\mu j}^{(j)} \mathcal{O} s_{\mu j}^{(j)} - \mathcal{O} + \frac{\mu}{2} \left[ s_{\mu j} \mathcal{O} \right]. \quad (F2)$$

In order to determine the effect of this decoherence on general collective spin operators, we expand the anti-commutator

$$\left[ S_{\mu j} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n \right]_+ = S_{\mu j} S_{\mu j}^\ell (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n S_{\mu j}^\ell (\ell + n + 2 \mu S_{\mu j}) (\mu S_{\mu j}^z)^m S_{\mu j}^n, \quad (F3)$$
which implies, using (E9),
\[ D(s_\mu) \left( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_\mu \right) = S^\ell_\mu (S + \mu S_z) \left( -1 + \mu S_z \right)^m S^{n}_{\mu} - S^\ell_\mu \left[ S + \frac{1}{2} (\ell + n) + \mu S_z \right] (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_{\mu}, \] (F4)
and, using (E10),
\[ D(s_\mu) \left( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_\mu \right) = S^\ell_\mu (S - \ell - n - \mu S_z) \left( 1 + \mu S_z \right)^m S^{n}_{\mu} - S^\ell_\mu \left[ S - \frac{1}{2} (\ell + n) - \mu S_z \right] (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_{\mu} + \ell n (2S - \ell - n + 2) S^{\ell-1}_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n-1}_{\mu} + \ell n (\ell - 1) (n - 1) S^{\ell-2}_\mu (S + \mu S_z) (-1 + \mu S_z)^m S^{n-2}_{\mu}. \] (F5)
Decoherence via jump operators \( s^{(j)} \) only couples operators \( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_{\mu} \) to operators \( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^{m'} S^{n}_{\mu} \) with \( m' \leq m \). Decoherence via jump operators \( s^{(j)} \), meanwhile, makes operators \( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_{\mu} \) “grow” in \( m \) through the last term in (F5), although the sum \( \ell + m + n \) does not grow.

2. Dephasing

The effect of decoherence via single-spin dephasing is described by
\[ D(s_z) \mathcal{O} = \sum_j \left( s^{(j)}_z \mathcal{O} s^{(j)}_z - \frac{1}{2} \left[ s^{(j)}_z s^{(j)}_z, \mathcal{O} \right] \right) = \sum_j s^{(j)}_z \mathcal{O} s^{(j)}_z - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{O}. \] (F6)
From (E5), we then have
\[ D(s_z) \left( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_\mu \right) = -\frac{1}{2} (\ell + n) S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_{\mu} + \ell n S^{\ell-1}_\mu (S + \mu S_z) (-1 + \mu S_z)^m S^{n-1}_{\mu}. \] (F7)
Decoherence via single-spin dephasing makes operators \( S^\ell_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S^{n}_\mu \) “grow” in \( m \), although the sum \( \ell + m + n \) does not grow.

3. The general case

The most general type of single-spin decoherence is described by
\[ D(g) \mathcal{O} = \sum_j \left( g^{(j)} \mathcal{O} g^{(j)} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ g^{(j)} g^{(j)}, \mathcal{O} \right] \right), \quad g \equiv g_x s_x + g_+ s_+ + g_- s_. \] (F8)
To simplify (F8), we expand
\[ g^\dagger \mathcal{O} g = |g_x|^2 s_x \mathcal{O} s_x + \sum_\mu \left( |g_\mu|^2 s_\mu \mathcal{O} s_\mu + g^*_\mu g_\mu s_\mu \mathcal{O} s_\mu + g_\mu^* g_\mu s_\mu \mathcal{O} s_\mu + g_\mu^* g_\mu s_\mu \mathcal{O} s_\mu \right), \] (F9)
and
\[ g^\dagger g = \frac{1}{4} |g_x|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_\mu \left[ |g_\mu|^2 \left( 1 - 2 s_\mu \right) + \mu \left( g^*_\mu g_\mu - g_\mu g^*_\mu \right) s_\mu \right], \] (F10)
which implies
\[ D(g) \mathcal{O} = \sum_{x \in \{x, +, -\}} |g_x|^2 D(s_x) \mathcal{O} + \sum_{\mu,j} \left( g_\mu^* g_\mu s^{(j)}_\mu \mathcal{O} s^{(j)}_\mu + g^*_\mu g_\mu s^{(j)}_\mu \mathcal{O} s^{(j)}_\mu + g^*_\mu g_\mu s^{(j)}_\mu \mathcal{O} s^{(j)}_\mu \right) - \frac{1}{4} \sum_\mu \mu \left( g^*_\mu g_\mu - g^*_\mu g_\mu \right) [S_\mu, \mathcal{O}]_+. \] (F11)
In order to compute the effect of this decoherence on general collective spin operators, we expand the anti-commutator
\[ [S_\mu, S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n]_+ = S_\mu^{\ell+1} [(\mu S_\mu)^m + (1 + \mu S_\mu)] S_\mu^n - n S_\mu^\ell (n - 1 + 2 \mu S_\mu) (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n. \] (F12)

Recognizing a resemblance between terms in (F12) and (E6), we collect terms to simplify
\[ \sum_j s^{(j)}_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n s^{(j)}_\mu = K_{\ell mn; \mu} + L_{\ell mn; \mu} \] (F13)
and likewise
\[ \sum_j s^{(j)}_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n s^{(j)}_\mu = K_{\ell mn; \mu} + M_{\ell mn; \mu} \] (F14)
with
\[ K_{\ell mn; \mu} \equiv \frac{1}{4} \mu S_\mu^{\ell+1} [(1 + \mu S_\mu)^m - (\mu S_\mu)^m] S_\mu^n, \] (F15)
\[ L_{\ell mn; \mu} \equiv -\mu n S_\mu^\ell S_\mu^n [S - \ell - \frac{3}{4} (n - 1) - \frac{1}{2} \mu S_\mu] (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^{n-1} - \mu \ell n (n - 1) S_\mu^{\ell-1} (S + \mu S_\mu) (-1 + \mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^{n-2}, \] (F16)
\[ M_{\ell mn; \mu} \equiv \mu n S_\mu^\ell [S + \mu S_\mu] (-1 + \mu S_\mu)^m - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[ \frac{1}{2} [n - 1] + \mu S_\mu \right] (\mu S_\mu)^m \right\} S_\mu^{n-1}. \] (F17)

Defining for completion
\[ P_{\ell mn; \mu} \equiv \sum_j s^{(j)}_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n s^{(j)}_\mu = n S_\mu^{\ell+1} (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^{n-1} - n (n - 1) S_\mu^{\ell} (S + \mu S_\mu) (-1 + \mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^{n-2}, \] (F18)
and
\[ Q^{(g)}_{\ell mn; \mu} \equiv \sum_j g_\mu^\ell g_\mu P_{\ell mn; \mu} + \left( g_\mu^\ell g_\mu + g_\mu^\ell g_\mu \right) K_{\ell mn; \mu} + \left( g_\mu^\ell g_\mu L_{\ell mn; \mu} + g_\mu^\ell g_\mu M_{\ell mn; \mu} \right), \] (F19)
we finally have
\[ D(g) \left( S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n \right) = \sum_{\chi \in \{+, -\}} |g_\chi|^2 D(s_X) \left( S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n \right) + Q^{(g)}_{\ell mn; \mu} + \left[ Q^{(g)}_{\ell mn; \mu} \right]^+. \] (F20)

Note that the sum \( \ell + m + n \) for operators \( S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n \) does not grow under this type of decoherence.

**Appendix G: Sandwich identities for collective-spin decoherence calculations**

In analogy with the work in Appendix E, in this section we work out sandwich identities necessary for collective-spin decoherence calculations. The simplest cases are
\[ S_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n S_\mu = S_\mu^{\ell+1} (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n, \] (G1)
\[ S_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n S_\mu = \mu S_\mu^{\ell+1} (n + \mu S_\mu) (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n, \] (G2)
\[ S_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n S_\mu = S_\mu^{\ell+1} \left[ \ell n + (\ell + n) \mu S_\mu + (\mu S_\mu)^2 \right] (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n. \] (G3)

With a bit more work, we can also find
\[ S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n S_\mu = S_\mu^{\ell+1} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n - n S_\mu^\ell (n - 1 + 2 \mu S_\mu) (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n, \] (G4)
which implies
\[ S_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n S_\mu = S_\mu^{\ell+2} (1 + \mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n - n S_\mu^{\ell+1} (n - 1 + 2 \mu S_\mu) (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu^n, \] (G5)
\[
S_\mu S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu = \mu S_\mu^{2\ell+1} (\ell + 1 + \mu S_z) (1 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \\
- \mu S_\mu \left[ \ell (n-1) + (2\ell + n-1) \mu S_z + 2(\mu S_z)^2 \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}.
\]  
(G6)

Finally, we compute
\[
S_\mu S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu = S_\mu S_\mu (1 + \mu S_z)^m = (S_\mu S_\mu - 2\mu S_z) (1 + \mu S_z)^m = S_\mu (2 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu - 2\mu S_z (1 + \mu S_z)^m.
\]  
(G8)

so
\[
S_\mu S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu = S_\mu^{2\ell+1} (2 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \\
- S_\mu \left[ \ell (\ell + 1) + n (n+1) + 2(\ell + n+1) \mu S_z \right] (1 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \\
+ \ell n S_\mu^{\ell-1} \left[ (\ell - 1) (n-1) + 2(\ell + n-2) \mu S_z + 4(\mu S_z)^2 \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}.
\]  
(G9)

**Appendix H: Collective spin decoherence**

In this section we work out the effects of collective decoherence on general collective spin operators. For shorthand, we define
\[
\mathcal{D}(G) \mathcal{O} \equiv \mathcal{D}(\{G\}) \mathcal{O} = G^\dagger OG - \frac{1}{2} \left[ G^\dagger G, \mathcal{O} \right]_+,
\]  
(H1)

where \(G\) is a collective spin jump operator.

### 1. Decay-type decoherence and dephasing

Making use of the results in Appendix G, we find that the effects of collective decay-type decoherence on general collective spin operators are given by
\[
\mathcal{D}(S_\mu) \left( S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu \right) = -S_\mu^{\ell+1} \left[ (1 + \mu S_z)^m - (\mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n+1} \\
+ \frac{1}{2} S_\mu \left[ \ell (\ell - 1) + n (n-1) + 2(\ell + n) \mu S_z \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n,
\]  
(H2)

and
\[
\mathcal{D}(S_\mu) \left( S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu \right) = S_\mu^{\ell+1} \left[ (2 + \mu S_z)^m - (1 + \mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n+1} \\
- S_\mu \left[ \ell (\ell + 1) + n (n+1) + 2(\ell + n+1) \mu S_z \right] (1 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \\
+ \frac{1}{2} S_\mu \left[ \ell (\ell + 1) + n (n+1) + 2(\ell + n+2) \mu S_z \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \\
+ \ell n S_\mu^{\ell-1} \left[ (\ell - 1) (n-1) + 2(\ell + n-2) \mu S_z + 4(\mu S_z)^2 \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}.
\]  
(H3)

Similarly, the effect of collective dephasing is given by
\[
\mathcal{D}(S_\mu) \left( S_\mu (\mu S_\mu)^m S_\mu \right) = -\frac{1}{2} (\ell - n)^2 S_\mu (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n.
\]  
(H4)
2. The general case

More generally, we consider jump operators of the form

$$G \equiv G_z S_z + G_+ S_+ + G_- S_-,$$  \hspace{1cm} (H5)

whose decoherence effects are determined by

$$G^\dagger O G = |G_z|^2 S_z OS_z + \sum_\mu \left( |G_\mu|^2 S_\mu OS_\mu + G_\mu^* G_\mu S_\mu OS_\mu + G_z^* G_\mu S_z OS_\mu + G_\mu^* G_z S_\mu OS_z \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H6)

and

$$G^\dagger G = |G_z|^2 S_z^2 + \sum_\mu \left( |G_\mu|^2 S_\mu^2 S_\mu + G_\mu^* G_\mu S_\mu S_\mu + G_z^* G_\mu S_z S_\mu + G_\mu^* G_z S_\mu^2 \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H7)

which implies

$$D(G)O = \sum_{x \in \{z, +, -\}} |G_x|^2 D(S_x)O + \sum_\mu \left( G_\mu^* G_\mu S_\mu OS_\mu + G_\mu^* G_\mu S_\mu S_\mu + G_\mu^* G_\mu S_\mu OS_\mu \right)$$
$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_\mu \left( G_\mu^* G_\mu \left[ S_\mu^2, O \right]_+ + G_\mu^* G_\mu \left[ S_\mu S_\mu, O \right]_+ + G_\mu^* G_\mu \left[ S_\mu S_z, O \right]_+ \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (H8)

In order to compute the effect of this decoherence on general collective spin operators, we expand the anti-commutators

$$\left[ S_\mu^2, S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m \right]_+ = S_\mu^{\ell+2} \left[ (2 + \mu S_z)^m + (\mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n-1} - 2nS_\mu^{\ell+1} (n + 2 \mu S_z)(1 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$+ n(n - 1) S_\mu^{\ell} (n - 1)(n - 2) + 2(2n - 3) \mu S_z + 4(\mu S_z)^2 \right) (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H9)

$$\left[ S_\mu S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m \right]_+ = \mu S_\mu^{\ell+1} \left[ (\ell + 1 + \mu S_z) (\mu S_z)^m + (n + 1 + \mu S_z)(1 + \mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$- \mu n S_\mu^\ell \left[ (n - 1) + (3n - 1) \mu S_z + 2(\mu S_z)^2 \right] (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H10)

Collecting terms and defining

$$G_{z,\mu}^{(\pm)} = \frac{1}{2} \left( G_\mu^* G_\mu \pm G_\mu^* G_z \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H12)

$$\hat{L}_{\ell m n; \mu}^{(G)} = \mu \left[ \left( \ell - n + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(+)} + \left( \ell + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} \right] S_\mu^{\ell+1} (1 + \mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$- \mu \left[ \left( \ell - n + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(+)} + \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} \right] S_\mu^{\ell+1} (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$+ \mu G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} S_\mu^{\ell+1} (1 + \mu S_z)^m (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H13)

$$\hat{M}_{\ell m n; \mu} = - \mu n (n - 1) \left[ \left( \ell - n + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(+)} + \left( \ell - \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} \right] S_\mu^{\ell} (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$- 2 \mu n \left[ \left( \ell - n + \frac{1}{2} \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(+)} + \left( \ell - \frac{1}{2} n - 1 \right) G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} \right] S_\mu^{\ell}(\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$- 2 \mu n G_{z,\mu}^{(-)} S_\mu^{\ell} (\mu S_z)^{m+2} S_\mu^{n-1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H14)

$$\hat{P}_{\ell m n; \mu} = - \frac{1}{2} S_\mu^{\ell+2} \left[ (2 + \mu S_z)^m - 2(1 + \mu S_z)^m + (\mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$+ n S_\mu^{\ell+1} \left[ (n + 2 \mu S_z)(1 + \mu S_z)^m - (n - 1 + 2 \mu S_z)(\mu S_z)^m \right] S_\mu^{n-1}$$
$$- n(n - 1) S_\mu^{\ell} \left( \frac{1}{2} (n - 1)(n - 2) + 2(n - 3) \mu S_z + 2(\mu S_z)^2 \right) (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^{n-2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H15)
\[ \hat{Q}_{\ell mn;\mu}^{(G)} \equiv G_{\mu}^* G_{\mu} \hat{P}_{\ell mn;\mu} + \hat{L}_{\ell mn;\mu}^{(G)} + \hat{M}_{\ell mn;\mu}^{(G)}, \]

we then have

\[ \mathcal{D}(G) \left( S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \right) = \sum_{X \in \{ \pm \}} |G_X|^2 \mathcal{D}(S_X) \left( S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \right) + \hat{Q}_{\ell mn;\mu}^{(G)} + \left[ \hat{Q}_{nm\ell;\mu}^{(G)} \right. \]  

(H17)

Note that the sum \( \ell + m + n \) for operators \( (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n \) grows by one if \( G_\mu \neq 0 \) or \( G_\mu \neq 0 \), and does not grow otherwise.

**Appendix I: Initial conditions**

Here we compute the expectation values of collective spin operators with respect to spin-polarized (Gaussian) states. These states are parameterized by polar and azimuthal angles \( \theta \in [0, \pi), \phi \in [0, 2\pi) \), and lie within the Dicke manifold spanned by states \(|k\rangle \propto S_+^{S+k} |\downarrow\rangle^N \) with \( S \equiv N/2 \) and \( S_z |k\rangle = k |k\rangle \):

\[ |\theta, \phi\rangle = \left[ \cos \left( \theta/2 \right) e^{-i \phi/2} |\uparrow\rangle + \sin \left( \theta/2 \right) e^{i \phi/2} |\downarrow\rangle \right]^N \]  

(I1)

We can likewise expand, within the Dicke manifold,

\[ S_z = \sum_{k=-S}^S k |k\rangle \langle k| , \quad S_\mu = \sum_{k=-S+\delta_{\mu,1}}^{S-\delta_{\mu,1}} g_\mu (k) |k + \mu\rangle \langle k| = \sum_{k=-S+\delta_{\mu,-1}}^{S-\delta_{\mu,-1}} g_\mu (k) |k - \mu\rangle \langle k| , \]

(II)

where \( \bar{\mu} \equiv -\mu \in \{ +1, -1 \} \) and

\[ g_\mu (k) \equiv \sqrt{(S - k)(S + k\mu + 1)}, \]

(III)

which implies

\[ S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n = \sum_{\mu k = -S+\delta_{\mu,-1} \max \{ \ell, n \}}^{S-\delta_{\mu,1} \max \{ \ell, n \}} (\mu k)^m \left( \prod_{p=0}^{\ell-1} g_\mu (k + \mu p) \right) \left[ \prod_{q=0}^{n-1} g_\mu (k + \mu q) \right] |k + \mu \ell\rangle \langle k + \mu n| \]

(IV)

\[ = \sum_{\mu k = -S+\delta_{\mu,-1} \max \{ \ell, n \}}^{S-\delta_{\mu,1} \max \{ \ell, n \}} (\mu k)^m \frac{(S + k\mu + \ell)! (S + k\mu + n)!}{(S + \mu k)! (S + \mu n)!} \frac{(S - k\mu - \ell)! (S - k\mu - n)!}{(S - \mu k)! (S - \mu n)!} |k + \mu \ell\rangle \langle k + \mu n| \]

(V)

\[ = \sum_{k=-S}^{S-\max \{ \ell, n \}} k^m \frac{(S - k)! (S + k\mu + \ell)! (S + k\mu + n)!}{(S + k)! (S - k\mu - \ell)! (S - k\mu - n)!} \frac{(S - k)! (S + k\mu)! (S + k\mu + n)!}{(S + k)! (S - k\mu)! (S - k\mu + n)!} |\mu (k + \ell)\rangle \langle \mu (k + n)| . \]

(IV)

This expansion allows us to compute the expectation value

\[ \langle \theta, \phi | S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_z)^m S_\mu^n | \theta, \phi \rangle = e^{i \phi \ell (-n)} N^S \sum_{k=-S}^{S-\max \{ \ell, n \}} k^m \frac{(S - k)! f_\mu \ell n (k, \theta)}{(S + k)! (S - k\mu - \ell)! (S - k\mu - n)!} \]

(II)

\[ \times e^{i \phi \ell (-n)} (-1)^m N^{N-\max \{ \ell, n \}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-\max \{ \ell, n \}} \frac{(S - k)^m (N - k)! \tilde{f}_\mu \ell n (k, \theta)}{k! (N - k\mu - \ell)! (N - k\mu - n)!} \]

(II)

where

\[ f_\mu \ell n (k, \theta) \equiv \cos \left( \theta/2 \right)^{N+\mu (2k + \ell + n)} \sin \left( \theta/2 \right)^{N-\mu (2k + \ell + n)}, \]

(IX)

\[ \tilde{f}_\mu \ell n (k, \theta) \equiv f_\mu \ell n (k - S, \theta) = \cos \left( \theta/2 \right)^{2N\delta_{\mu,-1} + \mu (2k + \ell + n)} \sin \left( \theta/2 \right)^{2N\delta_{\mu,1} - \mu (2k + \ell + n)}. \]

(X)
Defining the states
\[ |+Z\rangle \equiv |0,0\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle^\otimes N, \quad |\mu\rangle \equiv |0,0\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle^\otimes N, \quad |X\rangle \equiv |\pi/2,0\rangle = \left( |\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle \right)^\otimes N, \]
some particular expectation values of interest are
\[
\langle \nu \rangle |S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\nu^m) | \nu \rangle = \delta_{\ell n} \times \begin{cases} (S - n)^m \frac{N!n!}{(N - n)!} & \mu = \nu, \\ \delta_{n,0} (-S)^m & \mu \neq \nu, \end{cases},
\]
and
\[
\langle \nu \rangle |S_\mu^\ell (\mu S_\nu^m) | \nu \rangle = (-1)^m \frac{N!}{2^N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-\max\{\ell,n\}} \frac{(S - k)^m (N - k)!}{k! (N - k - \ell)! (N - k - n)!}.
\]

Appendix J: Computing correlators with the truncated short-time (TST) expansion

Here, we provide a pedagogical tutorial for computing correlators using the truncated short-time (TST) expansion. For concreteness, we nominally consider \( N \) spins evolving under the one-axis twisting (OAT) Hamiltonian
\[ H_{\text{OAT}} = \chi S_x^2, \]
additionally subject to spontaneous single-spin decay at rate \( \gamma_\downarrow \), with jump operators \( \mathcal{A}_\downarrow \equiv \{ S^{(j)}_\downarrow : j = 1, 2, \cdots, N \} \). The equation of motion for a Heisenberg operator \( S^m_+ S^m_- \) is
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( S^m_+ S^m_- \right) = i \chi \left[ S^2_+, S^m_+ S^m_- \right] + \gamma_\downarrow \mathcal{D} (\mathcal{A}_\downarrow) \left( S^m_+ S^m_- \right),
\]
where we can use the results in appendices D and F respectively to evaluate the commutator \( \left[ S^2_+, S^m_+ S^m_- \right] \) and dissipator \( \mathcal{D} (\mathcal{A}_\downarrow) \left( S^m_+ S^m_- \right) \) in (J2) (see (D1) and (F4) in particular), giving us
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( S^m_+ S^m_- \right) = i \chi (\ell - n) S^m_+ (\ell + n + 2S_x) S^m_- + \gamma_\downarrow \left[ (S + S_x) (-1 + S_x)^m - \left( S + \frac{n + \ell}{2} + S_x \right) \right] S^m_-.
\]
In practice, we do not want to keep track of such an expansion by hand, especially in the case of e.g. the two-axis dissipator \( D_\mu \) and decoherence processes \( \{ (\mathcal{A}_\mu, \gamma_\mu) \} \) may take several lines just to write out in full. Defining the operators \( S_m \equiv S^m_+ S^m_- S^m_- \) with \( m \equiv (m_+, m_-, m_-) \) for shorthand, we note that the vector space spanned by \( \{ S_m \} \) is closed under time evolution. We therefore expand
\[
\frac{d}{dt} S_m = T S_m = \sum_m S_m T_{mn},
\]
where \( T \) is a superoperator that generates time evolution for Heisenberg operators. In the present example, the matrix elements \( T_{mn} \in \mathbb{C} \) of \( T \) are defined by (J3) and (J4). For any Hamiltonian \( H \) with decoherence characterized by sets of jump operators \( \mathcal{A} \) and decoherence rates \( \gamma_\mathcal{A} \), the matrix elements \( T_{mn} \) are more generally defined by
\[
T S_m = i [H, S_m]_- + \sum_\mathcal{A} \gamma_\mathcal{A} \mathcal{D} (\mathcal{A}) S_m = \sum_m S_m T_{mn}.
\]
The results in Appendices D, F, and H can be used to write model-agnostic codes that compute matrix elements \( T_{mn} \), taking a particular Hamiltonian \( H \) and decoherence processes \( \{ (\mathcal{A}_\mu, \gamma_\mu) \} \) as inputs.

In order to compute a quantity such as spin squeezing, we need to compute correlators of the form \( \langle S_n (t) \rangle \), where \( S_n (t) \) is the time-evolved Heisenberg operator corresponding to \( S_n \) with \( S_n (0) \equiv S_n \). The order-\( M \) truncated short-time (TST) expansion takes
\[
\langle S_n (t) \rangle \rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{M} \frac{t^k}{k!} \sum_m \langle S_m (0) \rangle T_{mn}^k.
\]
where $T_{mn}^k$ are matrix elements of the $k$-th time derivative operator, given by

$$
T_{mn}^0 \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & m = n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}, \quad T_{mn}^1 \equiv T_{mn}, \quad T_{mn}^{k>1} \equiv \sum_{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{k-1}} T_{m p_1 p_2 \cdots T_{p_k} p_2 p_1 p_1 n}. \quad (J7)
$$

Matrix elements $T_{mn}^k$ and initial-time expectation values $\langle S_m (0) \rangle$ are thus computed as needed for any particular correlator $\langle S_n (t) \rangle$ of interest, and combined according to (J6). Note that initial-time expectation values $\langle S_m (0) \rangle$ are an input to the TST expansion, and need to be computed separately for any given initial state; expectation values with respect to spin-polarized (Gaussian) states are provided in Appendix I. In practice, we further collect terms in the TST expansion, and need to be computed separately for any given initial state; expectation values by $\tilde{T}$ of Heisenberg time evolution under the perturbed (unperturbed) Hamiltonian by $T$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}$ is a superoperator whose action on operators $\mathcal{O}$ is defined by

$$
\tilde{V} \mathcal{O} \equiv [V, \mathcal{O}]_-. 
$$

(K2)

Through quadratic order in the time $t$ and linear order in the perturbation $\tilde{V}$, we can say that

$$
e^{it\tilde{T}} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ e^{itT}, e^{it\tilde{V}} \right]_+ \approx e^{itT} + \frac{1}{2} it \left[ e^{itT}, \tilde{V} \right]_+ . \quad (K3)
$$

Defining perturbed and unperturbed Heisenberg operators $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} (t) \equiv e^{it\tilde{T}} \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O} (t) \equiv e^{itT} \mathcal{O}$, we thus find that for sufficiently small times $t$ and weak perturbations $\tilde{V}$,

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{O}} (t) - \mathcal{O} (t) = \left( e^{it\tilde{T}} - e^{itT} \right) \mathcal{O} \approx \frac{1}{2} it \left( [V, \mathcal{O}]_- (t) + [V, \mathcal{O} (t)]_- \right) . \quad (K4)
$$

Two-time operators $V \mathcal{O} (t)$ and $\mathcal{O} (t) V$, in addition to the Heisenberg operators $(V \mathcal{O} (t))$ and $(\mathcal{O} V) (t)$, thus determine the short-time linear response of operators $\mathcal{O} (t)$ to perturbations $V$ of a Hamiltonian.

Appendix K: Short-time linear response and two-time correlators

Here, we discuss the appearance of two-time correlation functions in the short-time linear response of correlators to perturbations of a Hamiltonian. Consider an initial Hamiltonian $H$ perturbed by an operator $\tilde{V}$ with $\| \tilde{V} \| \ll \| H \|$, where $\| \mathcal{O} \|$ denotes the operator norm of $\mathcal{O}$, such that the net Hamiltonian is $H = H + \tilde{V}$. We denote the generator of Heisenberg time evolution under the perturbed (unperturbed) Hamiltonian by $\tilde{T}$ ($T$). These generators are related by

$$
\tilde{T} = T + i \tilde{V} 
$$

(K1)

where $\tilde{V}$ is a superoperator whose action on operators $\mathcal{O}$ is defined by

$$
\tilde{V} \mathcal{O} \equiv [V, \mathcal{O}]_- . 
$$

(K2)

Through quadratic order in the time $t$ and linear order in the perturbation $\tilde{V}$, we can say that

$$
e^{it\tilde{T}} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ e^{itT}, e^{it\tilde{V}} \right]_+ \approx e^{itT} + \frac{1}{2} it \left[ e^{itT}, \tilde{V} \right]_+ . \quad (K3)
$$

Defining perturbed and unperturbed Heisenberg operators $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} (t) \equiv e^{it\tilde{T}} \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O} (t) \equiv e^{itT} \mathcal{O}$, we thus find that for sufficiently small times $t$ and weak perturbations $\tilde{V}$,

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{O}} (t) - \mathcal{O} (t) = \left( e^{it\tilde{T}} - e^{itT} \right) \mathcal{O} \approx \frac{1}{2} it \left( [V, \mathcal{O}]_- (t) + [V, \mathcal{O} (t)]_- \right) . \quad (K4)
$$

Two-time operators $V \mathcal{O} (t)$ and $\mathcal{O} (t) V$, in addition to the Heisenberg operators $(V \mathcal{O} (t))$ and $(\mathcal{O} V) (t)$, thus determine the short-time linear response of operators $\mathcal{O} (t)$ to perturbations $V$ of a Hamiltonian.


In retrospect, it may have been nicer to push all $s^{(j)}$ operators to the right throughout these calculations, due to the enhanced symmetry expressions would have with respect to Hermitian conjugation. In any case, we provide the final result of this section in both ordering conventions, and therefore feel no need to reproduce these calculations with a different ordering of spin operators.